

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/667,853 09/22/2003		0/22/2003	Jie-Wei Chen	03-562	1394
34704	7590	02/24/2006		EXAMINER	
		DINTE, P.C.	PIAZZA CORCORAN, GLADYS JOSEFINA		
900 CHAPE SUITE 1201	LSIREEI		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW HAVEN, CT 06510				1744	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	_						
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany		10/667,853	CHEN ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Gladys JP Corcoran	1733				
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	oears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a repty be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 D</u>	ecember 2005.					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	••	•	•				
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
=	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.	•					
_	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•				
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc	epted or b)□ objected to by the B	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		• •				
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ⊠ All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
	1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in Application	on No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	·	ed in this National Stage				
* 0	application from the International Bureau	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
- 3	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachmen	t(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate atent Application (PTO-152)				
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	. ,				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

FINAL ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Azdasht (DE 4319742) in view of Itagaki (JP 58163587).

Azdasht is directed to a laser welding apparatus comprising a processing head

(1) that allows a laser beam to be directed within it and through a laser transparent roller

(3) that exerts pressure on the weld area (See Figure and English abstract).

Azdasht is silent towards having a focusing means for focusing the laser beam or specifically a pressing device that presses the processing head against the weld area. One skilled in the art would have readily appreciated that it is conventional in the laser art to have focusing means for focusing lasers guided through a processing head onto a surface for laminating articles together. Itagaki discloses an example of a conventional laser pen where the laser beam is focused through a focusing means in order to properly focus the beam being directed toward the bond area (see Figure 4). One skilled in the art also would have readily appreciated that the processing head (bond head) of Azdasht would need a pressing device of some sort in order to exert pressure on the weld as it teaches that the ball 3 directly presses the contact elements together.

Furthermore, Itagaki shows an example in the art of providing a pressing means in order to provide pressure to the laser pen (Figure 6b).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a focusing means and pressing device in the apparatus of Azdasht in order to properly focus the beam and press the transparent roll against the bonding area as is considered known in the art and further exemplified by Itagaki.

As to claim 2, Azdasht discloses providing air in the processing head, thus the processing device is considered to have passages capable of having air injected therethrough (See Figure).

As to claims 3-4, it is well known and conventional in the laser welding art to have a plurality of parallel weld lines and to have a separate processing head for each weld line and to have a spacer between adjacent processing head. It would have been obvious to do so in the apparatus of Azdasht.

As to claim 5, one skilled in the art would have readily appreciated that pistons are a conventional pressing device and it would have been obvious to utilize a conventional pressing device in the apparatus of Azdasht.

As to claims 6 and 7, all the limitations are met by the references as discussed above in claims 1-4.

Terminal Disclaimer

3. The terminal disclaimer filed on December 2, 2005 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the

expiration date of US Application SN 10/667,708 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 2, 2005 have been fully considered but 4. they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 6 that the cited DE '742 does not show the claimed focusing means for directing a laser beam through the transparent roller and that the rollers in JP '587 are opaque and the laser beam is passed through a gap formed between the rollers and that there is no motivation to combine the two. However, as discussed above, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a focusing means for directing the laser beam in the apparatus as shown by Azdasht as such means are considered conventional in the art and further exemplified by Itagaki in order to properly focus the beam to the area being bonded, only the expected results would be attained.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in 5. this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/667,853

Art Unit: 1733

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Page 5

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gladys JP Corcoran whose telephone number is (571) 272-1214. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5:30pm (alternate Fridays off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571) 272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1733

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gladys P Corcoran Primary Examiner Art Unit 1733

GJPC